

TAB

SECRET

V. Evaluation Criteria

Individual evaluation statements were provided for most of the positions covered on the survey. The basis for the evaluations varied from case to case and no attempt was made to routinize the approach into an invariable format or to choose one evaluation method and pursue it to the exclusion of all others. As a result the statements vary from a simple citation of precedent to some rather full-blown analyses of external comparisons; some statements use the full factor-analysis treatment prescribed by the official position description format and others are confined to using only one or two of them. The only criterion that was universally applied, although not always successfully, was the matter of the evaluation being discriminating in terms of a specific grade level. Some of the methods used to pursue this end are discussed below.

A. Precedent Allocations

It was decided at the outset of the survey that as a general rule a position which had been allocated within the recent past and had not changed in any significant aspect since that time, would as a matter of course be sustained at the grade level previously accorded. This served to effectively and expeditiously classify large groups of positions by means of citing a precedent. Where official position descriptions had been prepared supporting the allocations used as a precedents, the task of evaluation was considerably simpler than in cases where the classification was either documented by unofficial descriptions or not documented at all. In the latter cases, it was necessary in many instances to trace the grade structure back through time by devious and often hit-or-miss methods, including reliance on the memories of associates and supervisors for clarifying information not available in the written record. This latter condition, that of having grades of positions officially approved without official supporting documentation or even unofficial documentation, is a peculiarity of the Agency's classification doctrine which should be subjected to exhaustive study. Such a study is beyond the scope of this present writing, except to note that the problem of whether or not to honor a T/O allocation in absence of a supporting and validating CWD allocation presented questions for which no ultimate general resolutions could be found.

B. CSC Standards

CSC standards were resorted to wherever they were applicable but their use was limited. In some cases there were no standards covering the type of positions encountered in the survey. In others, when standards existed for a given series, their application would have given results markedly in conflict with a decision previously made, or would have resulted in a grade seriously at variance with internal grade patterns which were not based on standards.

SECRET

C. Agency Position Standards

Few Agency standards have been published as of this writing and of those published the only one applicable to positions covered in the survey is that covering Courier work. Unpublished standards on Logistics type positions had been developed in certain instances as far as a preliminary draft. These were not, however, susceptible to use since the grade distinctions were for the most part unvalidated. As a matter of fact, the survey findings made necessary major changes in at least one of the standards which had been drafted prior to the survey.

D. Position Standards of other Agencies

In the case of numerous positions in the Logistics Office, the Army-Air Force Wage Board Plan provided a ready frame of reference. In applying gradients for WB-type jobs under this plan, the specifications developed by the Army and Air Force were used insofar as they were applicable, with due weight being given to difficulties accruing from the nature of Agency activities. Previous determinations had been made for certain key or "benchmark" jobs in the category; these were not reappraised, it being assumed that the previous interpretation was a proper application of the WB standards, with difficulties peculiar to the Agency weighted appropriately. Recognizing the prior determinations on the "benchmark" jobs as remaining valid gave a framework on which the rest of the WB grade pattern could be developed.

E. Lithographic Wage Board Standards

These standards continued to be valid for most of the categories of printing positions found at the various plants of the Printing and Reproduction Division. It should be noted that certain printing positions, on the basis of precedent, were continued under the GP Schedule, which is based on negotiated wage rates and does not entail a grading plan.

F. Position Comparisons

Both internal and external comparisons were used. In general, the internal comparisons call for no specific comment. The external comparisons, used largely for positions in the Procurement Division, tended to suppress rather than support grades now given or proposed for Agency work specialties. Even granting the Agency's undoubted peculiarities and giving due weight to the complexities of providing logistics support to a world-wide clandestine program, external comparisons had to be most liberally interpreted to even approximate the grade patterns felt by the Logistics Office to be commensurate for its work specialties. In a situation of this sort there are two opposing evils: (1) using the lowest comparatives available, with the possible effect of depressing the grade pattern below that needed to

SECRET

attract and hold adequate personnel; or (2) over-weighting the factors peculiar to the Agency, resulting in an inflated grade pattern in terms of other government operations, over-recruiting, and perhaps expenditure of an unwarranted sum of tax money for the services being performed. The complications of drifting into either of the two extremes are manifold. An earnest effort was made to choose a judicious midpoint between them.

G. Position Ranking

This method was used by itself and in conjunction with one or more of the other evaluation methods applied, and was frequently used as the cogent argument in conflicting determinations. As in the case of WS-type positions alluded to above, benchmark positions were sought the grade allocations of which could be considered reasonably firm, e.g. the long-range planning position in the Planning Staff. On the basis of comparison with the benchmark positions selected, other positions in the same organization component or in the same line of work were aligned into an internally consistent grade pattern.

In applying any of the above approaches to grading individual positions, prime consideration was given to the matter of internal consistency and a grade pattern was sought which was equitable within the individual components and equitable between components of the Logistics Office. To the extent that this objective was achieved, the survey findings with respect to logistics-support type positions can be used as a basis for aligning positions of this type found in operating offices, particularly in the DD/P complex, both headquarters and field.

SECRET